



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/815,052	03/31/2004	Jesper Kichn	M61.12-0615	7946
27366 7590 10/28/2008 WESTMAN CHAMPLIN (MICROSOFT CORPORATION) SUITE 1400 900 SECOND AVENUE SOUTH MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-3244				
EXAMINER HOFFMAN, BRANDON S				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2436				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/28/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 10/815,052  
Filing Date: March 31, 2004  
Appellant(s): KIEHN ET AL.

John D. Veldhuis-Kroeze (U.S. Reg. No. 38,354)  
For Appellant

**EXAMINER'S ANSWER**

This is in response to the appeal brief filed August 11, 2008, appealing from the Office action mailed December 10, 2007.

**(1) Real Party in Interest**

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

**(2) Related Appeals and Interferences**

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

**(3) Status of Claims**

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

**(4) Status of Amendments After Final**

No amendment after final has been filed.

**(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter**

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

**(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal**

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

**(7) Claims Appendix**

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

**(8) Evidence Relied Upon**

20040205355	Boozer et al.	10-2004
20040133583	Tingey	7-2004

**(9) Grounds of Rejection**

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3-18, 20-34, and 36-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boozer et al. (U.S. Patent Pub. 2004/0205355 A1) in view of Tingey (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2004/0133583).

Regarding claims 1, 18, and 34, Boozer et al. teaches a method/system/computer storage medium for providing Resource-Event-Agent (REA) model based security, the method/system/computer storage medium comprising:

- Identifying an REA defined association of a type which dictates ownership between a first object and a second object (page 1, paragraph 0016);
- Creating an association class for the REA defined association between the first object and second object, the association class defining security between the first object and the second object (page 1, paragraph 0018); and
- Storing the association class object on a tangible computer readable medium for use in providing security between the first object and the second object (paragraph 0088).

Boozer et al. does not specifically teach REA models and wherein creating the association class object for the association between the first object and the second object further comprises creating an association class object having properties defining security between the first object and the second object.

Tingey teaches REA models (fig. 1), and wherein creating the association class object for the association between the first object and the second object further comprises creating an association class object having properties defining security between the first object and the second object (paragraph 0066).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine creating an association class object having properties, the properties of the association class object defining the security between the first object and the second object, as taught by Tingey, with the method/system/computer readable medium of Boozer et al. It would have been obvious for such modifications because objects have properties that define the attributes of the object. The attributes define the object and therefore define the security between the two objects.

Regarding claims 3, 20, and 36, the combination of Boozer et al. in view of Tingey teaches wherein creating the association class object further comprises creating one or more association class objects having properties, properties of the one or more association class objects defining security between a first class of objects of which the

first object is a member and a second class of objects of which the second object is a member (see paragraph 0066 of Tingey).

Regarding claim 4, the combination of Boozer et al. in view of Tingey teaches wherein the second object is a securable object (see page 1, paragraph 0018 of Boozer et al., the objects may have security parents).

Regarding claims 5 and 21, the combination of Boozer et al. in view of Tingey teaches wherein the first object is of a particular agent type, and wherein a role for a user is defined by the particular agent type for the first object (see page 6, paragraph 0066 and 0076 of Boozer et al.).

Regarding claims 6-10 and 22-26, the combination of Boozer et al. in view of Tingey teaches wherein the second object is a contract or agreement type object, a commitment type object, an event type object, a resource type object, and an agent type object (see fig. 1 of Tingey, REA model contains all of the mentioned object types).

Regarding claims 11, 12, 27, and 28, the combination of Boozer et al. in view of Tingey teaches wherein identifying the REA defined association of the type which dictates ownership between the first object and the second object further comprises identifying an REA defined [control type/custody type] association between the first

object and the second object (see page 1, paragraph 0016 and page 3, paragraph 0033 of Boozer et al., control meaning 'ownership' and custody meaning 'template').

Regarding claims 13 and 29, the combination of Boozer et al. in view of Tingey teaches wherein creating the REA defined association class object for the association between the first object and the second object further comprises creating the association class object in a security model (see page 1, paragraph 0016 of Boozer et al.).

Regarding claims 14, 30, and 37, the combination of Boozer et al. in view of Tingey teaches wherein creating the association class object in the security model further comprises creating the association class object in the security model separate from the REA model (see fig. 19, ref. num 1200 of Boozer et al.).

Regarding claims 15, 31, and 38, the combination of Boozer et al. in view of Tingey teaches wherein creating the association class object in the security model further comprises creating the association class object in the security model as part of the REA model (see fig. 2 of Boozer et al.).

Regarding claims 16, 32, and 39, the combination of Boozer et al. in view of Tingey teaches wherein defining security between the first object and the second object further comprises defining permissions and rights of the first object relative to the second object (see page 2/3, paragraph 0029 of Boozer et al.).

Regarding claims 17 and 33, the combination of Boozer et al. in view of Tingey teaches wherein defining permissions and rights of the first object relative to the second object further comprises dynamically determining the permissions and rights in a security policy logic module outside of the security model (see paragraph 0066 of Tingey).

**(10) Response to Argument**

Appellant argues:

- a. Boozer does not teach REA models, particularly “creating an association class object for the REA defined association between the first object and the second object, the association class object having properties defining security between the first object and the second object” (page 8, second and third paragraph).
- b. Tingey does not teach REA security, namely “creating an association class object for the REA defined association between the first object and the second object, the association class object having properties defining security between the first object and the second object” (page 9, second paragraph through page 10, first paragraph).
- c. The combination of references does not teach identifying an REA defined [control type/custody type] association between the first object and the second object (page 11 and page 12).



Regarding argument (a), examiner disagrees with appellant. Boozer shows associations between objects to determine security between the objects. In figure 2, the first object and second object are in a relationship with each other, as imposed by the containment boundary (see paragraph 0018 of Boozer). The containment boundary establishes security rules for the two objects, which is an association class object. Boozer is not purported to teach REA model, but rather Tingey discloses an REA model. The rejection of the pending claims above was done in combination, using material from two references to arrive at the claimed invention. Boozer uses a model with objects and associations, just not an REA model, while Tingey discloses an REA model with objects having properties.

Regarding argument (b), examiner disagrees with appellant. Looking back at the rejection of claims 1, 18, and 34, above, Boozer was cited as teaching "identifying an REA defined association of a type which dictates ownership between and first object and a second object" and "creating an association class for the REA defined association between the first object and the second object, the association class defining security between the first object and the second object." It was then said that Boozer didn't teach a specific model (REA) and also did not teach that the created association class comprised properties defining security between the first object and second object. Therefore, what is required of Tingey is to teach REA modeling which uses properties to define security between two objects. Figure 1 of Tingey clearly shows that REA modeling is used. Paragraph 0066 of Tingey discloses security in a model that uses classification and hierarchy. The hierarchy of Tingey uses attributes (figure 15, for

example). Properties and attributes are synonymous terms; therefore, Tingey teaches "the association class object having attributes defining security between two objects."

Regarding argument (c), examiner disagrees with appellant. Examiner related the term "ownership" with the claimed "control" and the term "template" with the claimed "custody." Page 20, lines 9-12, of appellant's specification, teaches that "ownership" is interpreted to be a control type association. Page 20, lines 21-27, of appellants' specification, teaches that "responsibility" is interpreted to be a custody type association. The specification goes on to say that the Agent will be granted some default permissions on the Resource. This is an example of a template as disclosed by Boozer.

**(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix**

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

/Brandon S Hoffman/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2436

Conferees:

/Nasser G Moazzami/

Art Unit: 2436

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2436

/Kambiz Zand/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2434